

Progression through time is also taken into account, indicating an attempt to assess how far an admired trait has emerged as a result of the training. All such verification is certainly 'soft' (to use Hoffman's term), but there is no doubt that this text regards claims as testable.

My final assessment is that, whilst it would be wrong to equate primitive Buddhism with any form of science, the parallels are far more extensive than could be found in any other system normally labelled 'religion'. In an age which is too inclined to put the two disciplines in completely separate compartments, I regard such a conclusion to be of the greatest interest.

* * * * *

JHĀNA AND SAMĀDHI

John D. Ireland

It is the purpose of this essay to explore some aspects of what is signified by the term *jhāna* and its place in the scheme of Buddhist practice as it is found in early Buddhism. Meaning by early Buddhism what is set out in the Sutta Piṭaka of the Pāli Canon, in contrast to modern ideas regarding Buddhist 'meditation' and also the picture presented by fifth century CE commentators such as Buddhaghosa. This leads to an examination of the nature of the Eightfold Path and a number of misconceptions concerning it found in modern writings on the subject.

In the suttas it is the *sammāsamādhi* or right concentration of the Eightfold Path that is defined by the standard formula of the four *jhānas* and is the province of the *ariyasāvaka* or 'noble disciple', as are all factors of the Path. Here is the formula in Nāṇamoli's translation¹:

'Here, quite secluded from sensual desires, secluded from unprofitable things, a bhikkhu enters upon and abides in the first *jhāna*, which is accompanied by thinking and exploring, with happiness and pleasure born of seclusion.

'With the stilling of thinking and exploring he enters upon and abides in the second *jhāna*, which has self-confidence and singleness of mind without thinking and exploring, with happiness and pleasure born of concentration.

'With the fading as well of happiness he abides in onlooking equanimity and, mindful and fully aware, still feeling pleasure with the body, he enters upon and abides in the third *jhāna*, on account of which the Noble Ones say, "He has a pleasant abiding who is an onlooker with equanimity and is mindful".

'With the abandoning of pleasure and pain, and with the previous disappearance of joy and grief, he enters upon and abides in the fourth *jhāna*, which has neither pain nor pleasure, and the purity of whose mindfulness is

1 The translations by Nāṇamoli here and below are taken from *A Treasury of the Buddha's Discourses from the Majjhima-nikāya*, edited and published by Phra Khantipalo, 3 vols, Bangkok n.d.

due to onlooking-equanimity'.

It is usually assumed that the practice of the *jhānas* is pre-Buddhist, but is there really any solid evidence that this was so?² There is the problem that the Buddha employed terms used by his contemporaries, but then redefined them, often giving quite different and distinct meanings to them. It could be suspected that with all the eight factors of the Path, the summary of the core of the Buddha's teaching for his disciples, the terms used are defined in a special and specific way. Thus right view is actually not a 'view' at all in the accepted sense of a speculative opinion or dogma, a 'point-of-view', but a direct 'seeing' of reality. Again, *sati* means memory, but *sammāsati*, or right mindfulness, is a calling to mind of the present moment, a direct awareness of the here and now. It is also the contention here that the definition of *sammāsamādhi* in terms of the four *jhānas* is again a definition of *samādhi* different to what must have been the usual understanding of the word. However, in later times the term *jhāna* became generally accepted and widely known, was adopted retrospectively even outside Buddhism for *samādhi*-linked meditative states and thus apparently lost its novelty and uniqueness.

It is said that the practices of the two teachers the Buddha visited before the Enlightenment, Ālāra Kālāma and Udaka Rāmaputta, led to the *samādhi*-states of the formless or *arūpa*-spheres, the state of nothingness and that of neither-perception-nor-non-perception (M 26). But it is conceivable that these states were attained by ways other than the four *jhānas*. These formless *samādhis* were probably akin to such states as became known in later times in Hinduism, and Vedānta in particular, as *nirvikalpa-samādhi* and possibly not the same as the formless meditations (*arūpajjhāna*) as understood in Buddhism, although given these

2 Mrs Rhys Davids seems to be in broad agreement that the *jhānas* are uniquely Buddhist, cf. *Sakya or Buddhist Origins*, London 1931, New Delhi 1978, p.163f. See also J. Bronkhorst, *The Two Traditions of Meditation in Ancient India*, 2nd ed., Delhi 1993, p.22f.

names for want of a better. That the experiences the Buddha had with these two former teachers had no relation to the *jhānas* as later taught by him can be deduced from subsequent events. For, after leaving these teachers because he was dissatisfied with what they taught, the Buddha-to-be is said to have practised various ascetic and yogic methods for controlling the mind, such as breath-control and abstaining from food, so that he came near to death. But then there occurs a turning point. He thinks of a different way, something new and untried before, the practice of the *jhānas*! If the formless states he attained under Ālāra and Udaka were connected with and reached via the *jhānas*, as understood in later times, then he would have recollected the practice of the latter from that period. Instead, the attainment of *jhāna* was something he identified with a boyhood experience, which is suggestive, if not conclusive, evidence that the *jhānas* had no connection with anything practised by Ālāra and Udaka. Here is the passage in question from the Mahāsaccaka Sutta (M 36) in Nānamoli's translation again:

'But by this gruelling penance I have attained no distinction higher than the human state worthy of a noble one's knowledge and vision. Might there be another way to enlightenment? I then thought: "While my Sakyan father was busy, while I was sitting in the cool shade of a rose-apple tree, quite secluded from sensual desires, secluded from unprofitable things, I had direct knowledge of entering upon and abiding in the first *jhāna* which is accompanied by thinking and exploring, with happiness and pleasure born of seclusion. Might that be the way to enlightenment?" Then, following on that memory came the recognition, "This is the way to enlightenment". I thought, "Why am I afraid of that pleasure? It is a pleasure that has nothing to do with sensual desires and unprofitable things". I then thought, "I am not afraid of that pleasure. . .".

Now, what is *jhāna*? What can be deduced, if anything, about the nature of the experience of *jhāna* from this picture of a youth sitting quietly beneath a tree watching a man at work in the fields? One might forget that later legendary elaboration of this incident as the pampered prince, seated in state, while his father the king was performing the ceremonial ploughing around the royal palace of Kapilavatthu with crowds of attendants and citizens to hand, which obscures rather than helps. However, just attend to what was possibly the actual situation as described by

the Buddha: a boy sitting resting, perhaps having a break from his own labours, whilst his father continues to work, both absorbed in what they are experiencing and doing. Described here, it is suggested, is a detached seeing, a rapt awareness and clarity, but without involvement. The word *jhāna* is derived from the verb *jhāyati*: to think upon, contemplate, and is linked to the ideas of clarity and relaxed concentration. Wrong concentration is compared to the intensity of a cat watching a mouse, but right concentration is always associated with detachment and the absence of defilements, the 'unprofitable things', especially the five hindrances or *nīvaraṇas*: sense-desires, ill-will, lethargy-and-drowsiness, agitation-and-worry and doubt or hesitation.

The first *jhāna* is always said to arise from seclusion or detachment from sense desires, a separation from and a non-involvement with the usual preoccupations of the mind, the multiplicity of objects presented to the senses. An important preparatory practice for inducing *jhāna* is control or restraint of the sense-faculties (*indriya-saṃvara*), so that there are no value-judgements of likes and dislikes imposed upon the particular features and details of sense-objects; they are not identified through memories of past judgements and prejudices that would cloud and distract from actual seeing of what is factually present. This is the function of mindfulness and it is this as the seventh factor of the Path, right mindfulness, that is the necessary precondition for the arising of *jhāna*. Although all the other seven factors of the Eightfold Path, beginning with right view, are the conditions for the arising of right concentration (see M 117), it is right mindfulness that immediately precedes it and from which it arises. That the essential foundation for the whole Path is right view is stressed in the Mahācattārīsaka Sutta (M 117) with its repeated refrain, 'right view comes first'. Right view being the initial vision of the goal, the penetration of the Four Ariyan Truths: of suffering, its origin and ending and the path to be followed. Also in this sutta is shown that the factors of the Path are in causal sequence to each other, right purpose proceeds from (*pahoti*) right view, right speech proceeds from right purpose, and so forth. Thus right concentration arises from right mindfulness and from right concentration comes right knowledge and then

right deliverance, the two additional factors possessed by the arahant.

In the Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta (M 10), 'The Discourse on Establishing the Presence of Mindfulness', there are four areas of contemplation: the body, feelings, states of mind and the contents of mind, and a number of exercises relating to them. The object of the practice is to keep the mind attentive, alert and aware of the processes that are occurring in the present moment. The mind is kept continuously upon a single object, such as the breath going in and out — this is the main exercise of *ānāpānasati*. Whenever the mind wanders off it is brought firmly back again and again. The aim is continuity of mindfulness. Likewise, mindfulness is maintained in the four postures of walking, standing, sitting and lying down and in the various essential activities that have to be done, so that there is an unbroken continuity of mindful awareness and clarity. This mindfulness is then extended from the physical through the more subtle areas of feelings and sensations to the perception of mental states and processes. By continual effort in the practice — this is the factor of right effort — the continuity of mindfulness is gradually established. This continuity is essentially what is meant by the term *samatha* (evenness, calm). Why effort is needed is that the continuity is constantly being broken up by the distracting influence of the various hindrances. It is when the hindrances are suspended that perception is transformed, then something 'seen' is seen with a vivid and heightened awareness and becomes the sign of concentration and the access to *jhāna*. As when the venerable Mallaka, whilst looking at a ploughed field, attained *jhāna*: the sight of the brown earth becoming for him the earth-*kaṣiṇa* (object of concentration; see Visuddhimagga, p.123).

With the need for effort relaxed in the absence of the hindrances arise the so-called *jhāna*-factors, the most significant being the sensations of happiness and ease (*pīti*, *sukha*) and the experience of the first *jhāna* itself. The habit of mindful investigation, probing what is recognised as a new experience, yields the other two factors which accompany the first *jhāna*, thinking and exploring (*vitakka-vicāra*). The fifth *jhāna*-factor, singleness of mind (*cittass'ekaggatā*) or concentration, is the continuity of

mindful awareness itself. Upon familiarity with this state, thinking and exploring become unnecessary and being gross factors tend towards distraction and the break-up of the *jhāna*-state. They are therefore dropped and the second *jhāna* supervenes. Then the happiness or excitement (*pīti*) still present in the second *jhāna* is seen as a mark of instability and with its fading the third *jhāna* is reached. Finally, by shifting the focus away from the sensation of bodily ease or pleasure (*sukha*) the fourth *jhāna* is attained, a state of perfect equanimity and mindful awareness free from imperfections.

There are two aspects of *jhāna* that indicate its uniqueness within Buddhism. The first is its pleasurable aspect³. Outside of the Buddha's teaching the pleasurable nature of it tended to be condemned and concentration was more ascetical, inward looking and withdrawn. In Buddhist *jhāna* there is an expansion of the mind; the distinction between inner and outer is lost and the mind 'becomes great' (*mahaggatā*, extended, expanded). This is because there is no concept of a soul or a self dwelling within that could act as an inner focal point. The other aspect is its 'ariyan' nature, which permeates too the whole of the Eightfold Path, beginning with right view. Thus the second *jhāna*, where thinking and exploring, the 'vocal' factors that constitute 'inner speech', are absent, is called by the Buddha the 'ariyan silence' (*ariyatunhībhāva*) and the third *jhāna* formula specifically refers to it as a 'pleasant abiding' for the ariyans. In fact, all four *jhānas* are conceived as 'pleasant abidings here and now' for them. In the Sallekha Sutta (M 8) the form and formless *jhānas* are called respectively 'pleasant abidings' and 'peaceful abidings'. In the Nivāpa Sutta (M 25) all these *jhānas* are defined as states where Māra the Evil One has no access, and the disciple who has attained *jhāna* goes unseen by the Evil One and has crossed beyond the entanglements of this world.

It cannot be stressed too strongly that the ariyan Eightfold Path, culminating in *sammāsamādhi* defined as the four *jhānas*,

3 Cf. Bronkhorst, *op. cit.*, p.24.

is the exclusive province of the *ariyasāvaka*. It is beyond the knowledge and experience of the *puthujjana* or outsider, despite what is said in popular books on Buddhism and assumed in most scholarly works also. The entry to the Path is the acquisition of right view which is a direct vision of the Deathless (*amata*) or final goal of the cessation of suffering and the first step on the Path leading to that goal. From the suttas one gathers it was obtained usually only in the presence of the Buddha himself through a specific Dhamma-teaching from him⁴. The Buddha is said to be the 'giver or bestower of the Deathless' (*amatassa dātā*, cf. M 18) and it is having this experience that differentiates the *ariyasāvaka* from other beings. The definition of right view is knowledge of the Four Ariyan Truths and these too are of course exclusive to the *ariyasāvaka* and were never taught generally to all and sundry as many modern writers would have us believe. The usual translation of *ariya* as 'noble', as in 'Noble Truths', 'Noble Eightfold Path', etc., may be misleading if it is not indicated that it is nearly synonymous with 'supermundane' (*lokuttara*). It refers to a person who has realised (experienced) the supermundane, the vision of the Deathless, such as the sotāpanna, etc., and those able to communicate it, the Buddhas and arahants.

It is in the Commentaries and Buddhaghosa's Visuddhimagga that there are to be found references to a mundane (*lokiya*) Eightfold Path. However, in the Sutta Pitaka itself, there is little to suggest this was conceived to exist. There are many references in the suttas to a wrong (*micchā*) and right (*sammā*) path issuing from wrong view and right view respectively. There are also references to a mundane and supermundane right view. But, although it has been deduced from such references, M 117 for instance, that there is therefore an actual mundane path, this is not borne out upon careful examination. In this sutta (M 117) mundane right view and wrong view are defined as two opposing aspects, in the belief that merit accrues from giving (*dāna*), that good and bad deeds (*kamma*) produce their results in the future,

4 See P. Masfield, *Divine Revelation in Pāli Buddhism*, London 1986, p.37f.

etc., and its opposite:

'There is nothing given, nothing offered, nothing sacrificed, no fruit of ripening of good and bad deeds, there is no this world nor another world. . . .

However, the supermundane right view is defined as something completely different again:

'Any understanding, understanding faculty, understanding power, the investigation/enlightenment-factor (*bojjhaṅga*), right view as a path-factor (*maggaṅga*) in one whose mind is *ariya* and taint-free (*anāsava*), who possesses and develops the path. — this is called the ariyan right view, unaffected by the taints, which is supermundane and a factor of the path.'

Thus it is only the supermundane factors that are actually designated as path-factors and belong solely to the *ariyasāvaka*. It is the first five of these factors, from right view to right livelihood, that have their mundane counterparts, but these are not designated as actually belonging to a path as such. If it is insisted that they do, after all, constitute a mundane path, this would only be a fivefold path leading to rebirth in heaven, for the last three factors are not included in this scheme in the Mahācattārīsaka Sutta. It is true that elsewhere the factor of mindfulness, for instance, does have its mundane counterpart and is an important practice in its own right. It is conceivable that the insight and understanding arising through the practice of mundane mindfulness, the fourfold *satipaṭṭhāna* practice, would be a way of producing the supermundane right view and thus bringing the supermundane path into being. There are references to mundane *jhānas* (e.g. A II, p.126ff), but these are not associated with a mundane path and lead only to birth among the Brahma gods. The difference between the *ariyasāvaka* and the outsider or *puthujjana* is clarified in these suttas. For, whereas the *ariyasāvaka*, on completing his term of life among the Brahma gods, realises Parinibbāna, that is to say, he is a never-returner or *anāgāmin*, the *puthujjana* falls from that state into another birth. Moreover, the implication is more sinister in that the *puthujjana* is said to be *duggata*: destined for hell, animal birth and the realm of hungry ghosts, because of his wrong view and non-comprehension of the Four Ariyan Truths. Wrong view here being *sakkāyadiṭṭhi*, the view of individuality, the idea of a self

as being permanent and thought of as embodied in the aggregates (*khandhā*), a wrong view still possessed by one having the mundane right view of belief in meritorious deeds and so forth. *Sakkāyadiṭṭhi* is the first of the ten fetters (*samojāna*) and is got rid of only on becoming an *ariyasāvaka* and is the reason the disciple is not liable to be born in the lower realms of the *dug-gati* ever again. In the Sutta Piṭaka generally the effective pathway to mundane concentration and hence rebirth in the Brahma-world is by way of the *brahmavihāras*, the 'divine abidings' of unbounded kindness, compassion, etc., and not by way of the *jhānas* and a mundane Eightfold Path.

There are also references in the suttas to wrong concentration, but its nature and contents are not detailed at length. The forceful suppression of the mind by an effort of will may be a reference to a kind of wrong concentration practised by various non-Buddhist ascetics and by Gotama before his Enlightenment. There is also a kind of false *jhāna* practice disparagingly mentioned in M, suttas 50, 108, etc.:

'... with drooping shoulders, faces down-cast, as if drugged, they meditate, they meditate absorbed, they meditate more absorbed, they meditate quite absorbed⁵.

In the Māratajjaniya Sutta (M 50) such a practice is compared to an owl in a tree or a cat on a refuse-heap tracking a mouse, or a jackal on a river-bank absorbed in watching a fish in the water. In the Gopakamoggallāna Sutta (M 108) it is the meditation practice of one obsessed and overcome by sensual pleasures and the other hindrances, they being the objects of his meditation. In right concentration these hindrances are, of course, absent. The implication is that one obsessed by sensual pleasures is not in possession of the supermundane right view, the vision of the Deathless state, which is beyond this world of the senses and that he is unaware even of the existence of this state. In the Danta-bhūmi Sutta (M 125) one obsessed by sensual pleasure is com-

5 I.B. Horner's translation, *Middle Length Sayings*, PTS 1954-9, Vol.I, p.398; Vol.III, p.64.

pared to a person at the foot of a mountain being obstructed from seeing what lies on the other side and even doubting whether there is any view at all to be seen from the top. He is hemmed in by the mountain as Prince Jayasena, hemmed in by being immersed in sensual pleasures, doubts the existence of the singleness of mind achieved in *samādhi*. It is right view that supplies the proper motivation or right purpose, the second factor of the Path, for overcoming obsession and thus enabling the acquisition of right concentration and the cultivation of the four *jhānas*.

There is considerable confusion concerning the nature and purpose of *samādhi* and *jhāna*, and also the Eightfold Path itself and why the factors of the Path are in the order they are in. Much of this confusion stems from not recognising the transcendental nature of the Path. That it is, in fact, the supermundane path⁶. By not appreciating this, it is something of a mystery why the Path actually begins with right view, defined as the penetration of the Four Ariyan Truths, which seemingly ought to come at the end rather than the beginning. This difficulty has sometimes been overcome by devaluing and redefining right view as a kind of preliminary intellectual appreciation of the Buddha's teaching necessary to make a start in practising the 'path'. Another way of overcoming this difficulty has been actually to re-arrange the factors according to the 'three trainings' (*sikkhā*) or 'aggregates' (*khandhā*) of morality, concentration and wisdom. Then, right view could be placed in the last, under the category of 'wisdom'⁷. However, this apparent solution to the problem is *no* solution, for this threefold division is not an order of practice for a beginner, first commencing with morality and so forth. Rather they are those things cultivated and possessed by one who is already an *ariyasāvaka* and thus already in possession of the supermundane right view.

6 See Masfield, *op. cit.*, p.54.

7 See Nyanatiloka's *Buddhist Dictionary* (BPS), under *magga*, the source for much of the confusion concerning the 'path'.

A further source of confusion is the commentarial Abhidhamma dictum referring to the Path as a *javana*-moment of consciousness, the 'path-moment', that is followed without interval by moments of fruition. On the face of it, to regard a single moment of consciousness as a 'path' is absurd. There is no way the various references in the Sutta Piṭaka to the Path, to a person on the Path (of stream-entry, etc.) could be regarded as referring to a single conscious moment. It is only when the Path has been brought to completion, the moment before experiencing fruition for the first time, that such a moment of consciousness could be so designated. It is suggested, therefore, that the Abhidhamma 'path-moment' is actually the moment of 'exit' from the path into fruition, and not its 'entrance' which is the acquisition of right view and when the Path is as yet incomplete. What should not be confused is the difference between the sutta and Abhidhamma approach, between the sequential and momentary view of events. The sutta approach is to describe the steps necessary to achieve an aim, whereas the Abhidhamma approach is retrospective, answering the question: 'What factors (*dhammā*) were present at that moment?' It is worth noting that the theory of thought-moments is not found in the suttas nor the canonical Abhidhamma, but was introduced by the commentators, probably Buddhaghosa in his *Visuddhimagga*, and is derived from certain Hīnayāna schools then existing on the Indian mainland, such as the Sautrāntika. In the *Visuddhimagga*, Buddhaghosa has adopted a number of teachings from the latter school, despite their criticism in the (earlier) *Kathāvatthu* of Moggaliputtatissa!

Another difficulty is why the Path apparently ends in *samādhi*, rather than insight or wisdom (*vipassanā*, *paññā*), for instance. The argument goes that the practice of concentration or calm (*samatha*) ought to be associated with the practice of insight. However, the right concentration of the Eightfold Path should not be confused with such meditation practices as the development of calm and insight. The latter more properly belong with the cultivation of the mundane fourfold *satipaṭṭhāna* practice. The purpose of *sammāsamādhi* or *jhāna* as the culmination of the Path is that it provides the state of mind necessary for the ensuing experience of the fruition of the Path (*maggaphala*). In

several places (e.g. S I, p.233; DhP v.229, etc.) the *ariyasāvaka* is said to be endowed with wisdom (*paññā*, i.e. right view) and pure conduct (*sīla*), but no mention is made of *samādhi*. The suggestion is that he must put forth effort to achieve *samādhi*, thus completing the Path and enabling him to realise fruition (*phala*) which is its outcome. Beginning from the initial vision or right view, the entire Path is a sequence of steps that, as the Buddha says, 'plunges into the Deathless' (S V, p.58). Any insight gained was gained prior to entering the Path and was concluded upon the acquisition of right view or *paññā*.

It is the pure mindfulness and equanimity of the fourth *jhāna* that provides the basis for the four formless (*arūpa*-)*jhānas*, the various deliverances (*vimokkhā*), the direct knowledges (*abhiññā*) and the threefold knowledge (*tevijjā*): knowledge of former births, seeing the arising and passing away of other beings and the knowledge of the ending of the flow of defilements (*āśava*) of the arahant. For the Buddha and his disciples the fourth *jhāna* especially is a state they could enter whenever they wished to enjoy the fruition of arahantship (*arahattaphala*) and is then called the imperturbable or unmoving (*āneñja*-) *samādhi*. It was also from the fourth *jhāna* that the Buddha, and other arahants too, attained Parinibbāna or final passing away when life has ended.

* * * * *

EKOTTARĀGAMA (XXIV)

Translated from the Chinese Version by
Thích Huyền-Vi and Bhikkhu Pāsādika
in collaboration with Sara Boin-Webb

Tenth Fascicle
Part 19
(Supplication)

7. ¹Thus have I heard. At one time the Buddha was staying in Śrāvastī, at Jetī's Grove, in Anāthapiṇḍada's Park. Then the Exalted One said to the bhikkhus: There are these two modes of behaviour (*dharma*)² that cause a man to be born in a low and poor family.

¹ See T2, 595a9 ff.; Hayashi, p. 167 ff.

² Thematically, it could perhaps be maintained that this quite sinicised section has a parallel to be found in the EĀ fragments of the Gilgit MS; cf. Ōkubo (for bibliographical information see BSR 13, 1 (1996), p. 65, n. 25), p. 95, and C. Tripāthī, *Ekkottarāgama-Fragmente der Gilgit-Handschrift*, Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik, Monographie 2; Reinbek 1995, pp. 109, 210 f. Tripāthī ed. § 32.8 (p. 210 f.): *dvau dharmau na mātṛjñātāyai samvartete adharma-caryā viśama-caryā ca /...yathā na mātṛjñātāyai... (evaṃ na pitṛjñātāyai na śrāma) nyāya na brāhmaṇyāya na kule jyeṣṭha-pacāyitāyai.../* Because of two modes of behaviour, according to the Gilgit text, remissness (*adharmacaryā*) and rudeness (*viśamacaryā*), one neither honours one's mother nor one's father and, moreover, such behaviour is not conducive to asceticism, to brāhmanhood and, as far as one's family is concerned in a future existence, to the 'culmination of what is pre-eminent' (*jyeṣṭha-pacāyitā*, lit. 'that which has been caused to mature in regard to what is most excellent').

Normally, the past passive participle of the causative of √*pac* is *pācīta*. At Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar* 34.8 (p. 167), examples are given that correspond to *pācayita*. Even for the noun *pacāyitā* of the Gilgit MS Edgerton provides a corresponding example (albeit not as a feminine): *lālayita*, perhaps 'desire' (BHSD, p. 462). As for *pacāyitā* cf. G. Roth, *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*, Including Bhikṣuṇī-Prakīrṇaka and a Summary of the Bhikṣu-Prakīrṇaka of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin, Patna 1970, § 192 (p. 215, l. 5): *pacitum vā pacāyitum*, 'faire cuire ou de donner à faire cuire' (see É. Nolot, *Règles de discipline des nonnes bouddhistes, Le Bhikṣuṇīvinaya de l' école Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin*, Traduction annotée, commentaire, collation du manuscrit, Paris 1991, p. 228).